DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 105 249 95 CE 003 555

AUTHOR Sheppard, Nathaniel A.
TITLE Report and Evaluation of Workshop for Inservice Vocational Teachers of the Handicapped.
INSTITUTION Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ., Blacksburg. Dept. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.; Virginia State Dept. of Education, Richmond. Div. of Vocational Education.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 73p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Educable Mentally Handicapped; Evaluation; Handicapped; Institutes (Training Programs); *Multiply Handicapped; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Workshops; Trainable Mentally Handicapped

ABSTRACT

An evaluation was made of the effectiveness of a two-week workshop attended by 27 vocational instructors in Virginia and designed to help participants become better teachers of the mentally retarded and multiply handicapped. Following statements of objectives of both the workshop and the evaluation, a description of the workshop covers course topics, course requirements, and excerpts from various consultant presentations. Pre- and posttest evaluations are presented and analyzed. Detailed tabulations of participants' generally favorable evaluation of the workshop comprise a major section of the report, and their attitudes toward the employability of the mentally retarded are also tabulated. Appendixes include documents used in the workshop, lists and descriptions of participants, pretests and posttests, contents of topics covered, student course requirements, and the workshop evaluation scale. Recommendations resulting from the evaluation were: (1) have more field trips, (2) have consultants emphasize the practical rather than the theoretical, (3) have fewer consultants but have them available for the entire workshop, and (4) emphasize role playing in future workshops. (MDW)

FEB 18 1975

Report and Evaluation of Workshop I for Vocational Teachers of the Handicapped

ED105249

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROJECT DIRECTOR:
Dr. N. Alan Sheppard
Division of Vocational
and Technical Education

College of Education
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia
June, 1974

CE 003 555

REPORT AND EVALUATION OF WORKSHOP

FOR

INSERVICE VOCATIONAL TEACHERS OF THE HANDICAPPED

Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University

Blacksburg, Virginia

June 1 - 30, 1974

Project Director:

Dr. N. Alan Sheppard
Division of Vocational
and Technical Education

This project was supported by E. P. D. A., Part F, Section 554, and administered by the State Board of Education, Division of Vocational Education, Richmond, Virginia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The project director extends sincere thanks and appreciation to numerous individuals including Dr. D. A. Adams, Chairman, Division of Vocational and Technical Education; Ms. Maude Goldston, State Department of Education; Mr. A. B. Lyon of the Continuing Education Center; and the Vocational and Technical Education Staff at VPI & SU.

These aforementioned individuals are thanked for their whole-hearted cooperation, openness, and support.

We wish to thank especially those vocational teachers whose enthusiastic willingness to participate made the workshop a reality.

-- Nathaniel A. Sheppard
November, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
	A. General Information	1
	B. Objectives	1
	1. Evaluation Objectives	1
	2. Workshop Objectives	2
	C. Soliciting Workshop Participants	3
II.	Workshop Summary	4
	A. General Information	4
	1. Workshop Location	4
	2. Number of Student Workshop Participants	4
	3. Length of the Workshop	5
	4. Length of Class Sessions	5
	5. Instructors/Consultants Involved	5
	6. Workshop Facilities	5
	B. Pre-Workshop Evaluation	5
	C. Course Topics Covered	6
	D. Course Requirements	6
	E. Excerpts From Various Consultant Presentations	7
	F. Post-Workshop Evaluation	11
	1. Posttesting of Student Participants	11
	2. Pretest-Posttest Analysis	12

Page

3. Participants' Evaluation of the Workshop 13

4. Attitudes of Participants Toward the Mentally Retarded With Special Emphasis on Employability 36

G. Recommendations 37

III. Appendixes 38

A. Solicitation Letter 38

B. Preliminary Enrollment Information 39

C. Participant Acceptance Letter 40

D. List of Workshop Participants 43

E. List of Teachers/Consultants 44

F. Pretest Measure 45

G. Contents of Topics Covered 49

H. Student Course Requirements 54

I. Posttest Measure 55

J. Workshop Evaluation Scale 61

K. Description of Workshop Participants 64

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	In-Service Workshop for Teachers of the Handicapped Analysis of Workshop Evaluation Form	15
2	Comparison of Statements Asked on Evaluation Form According to Sex	20
3	Comparison of Statements Asked on Evaluation Form According to Vocational Area	23
4	Comparison of Statements Asked on Evaluation Form According to Number Years Teaching Experience . . .	29
5	Comparison of Statements Asked on Evaluation Form According to Number Years Taught Handicapped	33

WORKSHOP OBJECTIVE

To increase the effectiveness of teachers of mentally handicapped youth, primarily in the area of vocational training.

"One man's handicap becomes another man's challenge . . ."

Author Unknown

". . . What a man cannot do is not as important as what he is capable of doing."

I. Introduction to Workshop Evaluation

A. General Information

The Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, conducted a two-week workshop entitled, "In-Service Education Work for Vocational Teachers of the Handicapped." The workshop, held June 17-28, 1974, was funded by the State Board of Education, Division of Vocational Education, Richmond, Virginia, from funds available from EPDA, Pt. F, Section 554.

The purpose of the grant was to assist special and regular vocational education teachers to become more effective teachers of the mentally retarded and multiply-handicapped students. Major focus of workshop's content was on the mentally retarded student--EMRs and TMRs, as these two foregoing groups of students possess the kind of handicaps typically found in vocational education programs for handicapped students in Virginia. A lesser emphasis was given to those handicapped students who are multiply handicapped and have other concurrent handicaps; such as, hard of hearing, partially blind, emotionally disturbed, neurologically impaired, or orthopedically impaired.

B. Objectives

1. Evaluation Objectives

a. To describe the scope, sequence, organization, and implementation of the workshop

b. To measure the knowledge gained by workshop participants in teaching the mentally retarded

c. To determine the nature of knowledge gained, if any, relative to vocational service area, years teaching the handicapped, sex, and other significant variables pertaining to the workshop participants

d. To compare and contrast workshop participants' responses to the general workshop evaluation form

e. To offer recommendations based upon oral and written responses of workshop participants, consultants and others relative to future workshops of this nature

2. Workshop Objectives

a. Given the characteristics or vocational handicaps of the handicapped, the participant will be able to demonstrate instructional techniques in teaching vocational skills to each of the following:

(1) Mentally handicapped
- EMR (IQ Range = 50 - 75)
- TMR (IQ Range = 30 - 50)

(2) Multiply handicapped
- (Those with a combination of both handicaps--mentally and physically)

b. When presented with a hypothetical and/or actual situation involving working with a handicapped student, the participant will list and/or demonstrate the procedures, as discussed in class, for assessing the student's abilities, task analyzing the skill, and programming instruction in relation to a particular skill.

c. When presented with materials used in "existing programs," the participant will modify the materials and/or the approach used with those materials to meet the needs of the handicapped, as discussed in assigned readings and class presentation, to the satisfaction of the group.

d. The participant will evaluate his own school system/job placement on the basis of evaluation forms to be constructed by the group in relation to provisions for the handicapped and either individually or in groups discuss the results to the group's satisfaction for the purpose of making collective suggestions for improving such services.

e. The participant will demonstrate in writing his awareness of relevant Legislative Acts by responding to 90 percent criteria on an examination on the following and other(s) to be added:

(1) Vocational Education Act of 1963 and 1968 Amendments
(2) ESEA 1967 Amendments, Title VI

(3) Manpower
(4) Vocational Rehabilitation
(5) Others to be added

C. Soliciting Workshop Participants

A form letter was sent out statewide to selected vocational teachers of the disadvantaged and handicapped. These instructors were selected from prepared lists of vocational-technical instructors in all divisions of vocational-technical education in Virginia. The form letter sent out is shown in Appendix-A.

If a vocational-technical teacher desired to enroll in the workshop, he/she was instructed to fill out and return a Preliminary Enrollment Information Form; see Appendix-B.

Upon receipt of the Preliminary Enrollment Information Form, 32 vocational teachers were selected based upon recommendations from supervisors and expressed need for the course. A total of 50 applications were received. Thirty-two was the number decided upon due to such factors as: (1) size of meeting place for workshop and (2) stipend support via EPDA funds, etc. Of those 32 selected, five had to withdraw from the class after attending the first session due largely to registration complications and lack of complete information about the workshop relative to credit hours.

The workshop participants were varied in their backgrounds and competencies. At least five participants had masters degrees. Fifteen participants had bachelors degrees. Some of the participants had as many as 30 years of teaching experience. Several had extensive business experiences in various capacities.

Ethnic representation was principally that of Black and Anglo-Americans. Geographical representation included Northern Virginia, Central Virginia, Eastern Virginia, and Southwest Virginia. This contributed some variety and richness not to be found in a completely homogeneous group.

Of the 27 participants who remained during the two-week period, two were in administrative positions; seven were in vocational home economics; one was in industrial arts education; two were in distributive education; seven were in shop, general mechanics, commercial design, food services or building trades; two were in health occupations; four served as Work-Study Coordinators; one participant worked as a counselor; and one participant worked as an elementary teacher. A further breakdown of workshop participants can be seen in Appendix-K.

After the student-participant selection process had ended, each person selected to participate and attend the workshop was sent a letter of attendance confirmation. See Appendix-C.

II. Workshop Summary

A. General Information

1. Workshop Location

This workshop was held on the campus of VPI & SU in Blacksburg, Virginia.

2. Number of Student Workshop Participants

Twenty-seven special and regular vocational instructors from all areas of Virginia and in various divisions of vocational-technical education participated in the workshop. A list of the workshop participants is shown in Appendix-D.

3. Length of Workshop

This workshop was held for two weeks, or ten sessions, which began on June 17, 1974, and terminated on June 28, 1974.

4. Length of Class Sessions

Each class session was approximately three hours each, beginning at 1:30 p.m. daily.

5. Instructors/Consultants Involved

A team-teaching approach was initiated and consisted of individuals with experience in a variety of areas related to the handicapped. Film presentations, field trips, etc., were occasionally scheduled. A list of teachers/consultants who participated in the workshop appears in Appendix-E.

6. Workshop Facilities

VPI & SU made excellent provisions for the project. An expansive air-conditioned room was made available for lectures, discussions, and small group work. Also, library and housing accommodations were very adequate.

B. Pre-Workshop Evaluation

During the first workshop session, a pretest on the characteristics and training of mental retardates was administered to the student participants. A sample of this pretest is shown in Appendix-F.

1. Pretest Conclusions

a. Test Information

- Number of pretests given - 28
- Number of pretests completed - 26
- Number of questions on pretest - 40

b. Score Statistics (Based on a possible 100 points)

· Range of Scores	-	68 - 82
· Test Mean	-	76
· Test Mode	-	75
· Test Median	-	76

The analysis of the pretest and posttest scores is discussed in this evaluation report under Post-Workshop Evaluation, page 12.

C. Course Topics Covered

1. Topics Covered

a. Orientation to the Handicapped and Employment Potential of the Mentally Retarded

b. Teaching Vocational Skills to the Handicapped

c. Behavior Modification

d. Teaching Vocational Skills to the Mentally Retarded

e. Assessment and Prescriptive Teaching

f. Strategies in Teaching the Mentally Retarded Reading Skills

g. Sheltered Workshops

h. Program Evaluation and Instructional Materials

i. Overview of Special Vocational Education Programs in Virginia

D. Course Requirements

The course requirements for the students included each student's participation in one group task and his/her completing two individual tasks. The group task and individual tasks are outlined in Appendix-H.

1. Evaluation of Handicapped Program in Local School Division = 20%
2. Written Examination = 20%
3. Participation in Small Groups = 15%
4. Development and/or Modification of Curricula Material for Handicapped Students = 20%
5. Demonstration of Instructional Techniques in Teaching the Handicapped Student = 25%

E. Excerpts From Various Consultant Presentations

Excerpts from presentations given by various workshop consultants are given below. Excerpts are not given for each consultant because much of the taped classroom sessions was not audible.

1. Dr. Ruth Diggs

Dr. Diggs, from the Special Education Department at Norfolk State College, gave a presentation on the evaluation, modification, and construction of materials for use with mentally retarded students. Dr. Diggs was very qualified to speak on these topics as she has worked with EMRs and TMRs at the Petersburg Training School for three years, has taught elementary school for five years, and has an extensive background experience in teaching and working with the mentally handicapped. A few excerpts from her presentation are presented below.

Concerning the teacher, Dr. Diggs has these things to say:

a. A teacher needs creativity, ingenuity, perseverance, and other talents when meeting the needs of mentally retarded students. A teacher cannot sit down in the classroom and expect learning to take place.

b. A teacher needs objectives when teaching the mentally retarded; objectives for each child which are based on his interest.

c. A teacher must not be afraid to communicate with a mentally retarded student; the student can feel or sense this fear.

d. A teacher must give the mentally retarded student a feeling of being useful and help the student develop a good self concept.

e. A teacher needs to read books on exceptional children--not just vocational books. Also, they need to attend courses which help prepare teachers communicate and train the mentally handicapped.

Concerning the training of mentally retarded students, Dr. Diggs has these things to say:

a. When teaching the mentally retarded, skills to be developed by the student should be presented to the student in a definite sequence which has a natural interrelationship. This is necessary because EMRs are going to get married, buy a home, and have children. For these reasons, teachers need to (1) train them in areas which are taught to "normal" students (however, plan the mental retardate's training in specific, sequential segments), and (2) keep in mind that mental retardates cannot abstract at the high school level and must have things broken down into sequential steps.

b. To "reach" the handicapped and have them "achieve," the teacher needs to allow for interaction in groups; use audio-visual equipment; such as, overhead projector, opaque projector; and make own visual aids--slides, transparencies, etc.

c. A teacher can use music to bring out potentialities of mentally retarded students.

d. When developing occupational competence of the mental retardate, a teacher needs to keep these things in mind:

- many mental retardates have dominate interests and talents which have not been discovered; these talents need to be made known
- mental retardates need vocational and educational guidance; a guidance counselor who gives misguidance is worse than no guidance counselor at all
- if tests are used, they need to be used properly and only as instruments to improve instruction
- must find suitable job for mental retardate, if not, the teacher is wasting his time training the mental retardate. Also, the student must be capable of handling the job
- information about available jobs must be provided to the mental retardate; interest in these available jobs must be stimulated
- advise the mental retardate about the demands and responsibilities of particular jobs
- mental retardates need to be effectively trained in specific areas and need to obtain a degree of competence in these areas

Concerning the evaluation or assessment of mentally retarded students, Dr. Diggs has these things to say:

a. Assessment of aptitudes of the retarded student is important because the results of assessment can be utilized in providing adequate planning in the total program.

b. It is impossible to measure the potentiality of any individual, however, one can measure or get an estimate of the present operating level of an individual.

c. Assessment is a continuing process and not tied to anything in isolation; assessment should be a part of the total training program.

General comments made by Dr. Diggs were:

a. No field is any more important to special education development than vocational people in all areas.

b. Behavior modification is "old fashion" reinforcement.

c. Dr. Diggs' bag is not talking about what is new but talking about how the good materials and literature that has been out for 20 years can be efficiently and effectively utilized and developed.

2. Dr. Frank Bowles

Dr. Bowles is from the Special Education Department at Radford College and gave a presentation on the strategies and techniques in teaching vocational skills to the handicapped and discussed job placement, referral services, etc., available to the mentally handicapped.

Dr. Bowles mentioned that handicapped students were able to become occupational employees; such as, restaurant workers, farm workers, newspaper employees, grocery store clerks, truck drivers, construction workers, maintenance personnel, service station attendants, meat cutters, house painters, custodial

workers, electrician's helper, etc. The mentally retarded not only can work in these occupational areas but can work well in them.

Dr. Bowles also mentioned several resource centers which can provide literature and information for those teaching the mentally retarded. Several resource centers mentioned were the Library of Congress and the Virginia State Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped.

Dr. Bowles indicated that it was important when training the mentally retarded in occupational work habits and skills that the student understands why work, how to apply and get a job, how to quit a job, and what is meant by acceptable work habits.

Dr. Bowles also emphasized the need for a full-time vocational placement counselor in the public schools. The placement counselor should not have any classroom responsibility but should have a good working relationship with the teachers.

A very important point emphasized by Dr. Bowles was the aim of a special education program--that of vocational placement and success when dealing with EMRs--making them employable!

3. Conclusion

Appendix-G gives a summary of the topics presented by each workshop consultant.

F. Post-Workshop Evaluation

1. Posttesting of Student Participants

During the last workshop session a posttest was administered to workshop participants. A sample of this posttest is shown in Appendix-I.

This posttest contained forty parallel questions administered in the pretest.

a. Posttest Conclusions

(1) Test Information

- Number of posttests given - 27
- Number of posttests completed - 27
- Number of questions on posttest - 55

(2) Score Statistics (Based on a possible 100 points)

- Range of Scores - 62.5 - 87.5
- Test Mean - 80
- Test Mode - 80
- Test Median - 80

2. Pretest-Posttest Analysis

Data were collected from 27 participants on the pretest. The mean score (See Section B) was 76. Also, data were collected from 27 workshop participants on the posttest examination (See Section E). The mean score was 80. A difference of +4 (gain score) exists between the pretest-posttest scores.

The sign test was used to determine statistically whether workshop participants showed any change between the pretest-posttest examinations or to test the hypothesis that:

> The number of gains (plus changes) would equal the number of losses (minus changes).

The following formula was employed:

$$z = \frac{0 - NP}{\sqrt{NP\ (1-P)}}$$

0 = + changes
N = + and - changes
P = .5 (equal probability of a gain or loss)

In the workshop:

18 participants improved
6 participants scored lower
2 showed no change

$$Z = \frac{18 - 24(.5)}{\sqrt{(24)\ (.5)\ (1-5)}} = \frac{18-12}{\sqrt{6}} = 2.44$$

Since the major concern was the number of participants who improved their scores, a one-tailed test was appropriate. The significance testing level was .05 with a corresponding table value of 1.64.

Thus, the calculated Z value exceeds the table of 1.64, the null hypothesis is rejected at the .05 level of significance. It is likely that the workshop was effective. Of course, there is a 5 percent probability that the apparent improvement resulted from sampling error or chance variation rather than the influence of the workshop.

3. Participants' Evaluation of the Workshop

The workshop evaluation form completed by the 27 workshop participants is shown in Appendix-J.

Each statement was rated by each participant as strongly agree (represented by the number 5); agree (4); undecided (3); disagree (2); and strongly disagree (1).

Statements were either positively stated (such as, the material presented was valuable) or negatively stated (such as, the information presented was too elementary). Statements which were presented positively received a score value of 4 (agree)

or 5 (strongly agree) and statements which were presented negatively received a 1 (strongly disagree) or a 2 (disagree).

a. Analysis of Workshop Evaluation Form Completed by Group

Table 1, page 15, gives an analysis of the evaluation form pertaining to the number of participant responses received by each possible answer category. A mean score showing the consensus of the group is also given.

The following lists illustrate where statements fell on the rating scale, 1-5.

(1) Statements which received a mean score between 4 (agree) and 5 (strongly agree) were statements:

1 The purposes of this workshop were clear to me (+)

4 The participants accepted the purposes of this workshop (+)

7 The material presented was valuable (+)

9 Possible solutions to my problems were considered (+)

11 The speakers really knew their subject (+)

13 I was stimulated to think objectively about the topics presented (+)

14 New acquaintances were made which will help in my future work (+)

15 We worked together as a group (+)

19 The group discussions were excellent (+)

22 I really felt a part of this group (+)

23 My time was well spent (+)

24 The program met my expectations (+)

29 Workshops of this nature should be offered again in future years (+)

31 The research findings presented were useful to me in my job (+)

TABLE 1

IN-SERVICE WORKSHOP FOR TEACHERS OF THE HANDICAPPED

ANALYSIS OF WORKSHOP EVALUATION FORM

(Frequency and Type of Responses to--and Mean Score on--
Statements Presented on Evaluation Form)

STATEMENT	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANT RESPONSES RECEIVED BY EACH ANSWER CATEGORY					
	**5 SA	4 A	3 U	2 D	1 SD	MEAN
1. * + The purposes of this workshop were clear to me.	9	17	0	1	0	4.2593
2. - The objectives of this workshop were not realistic.	0	6	1	12	8	2.1852
3. + Specific purposes made it easy to work efficiently.	4	18	3	2	0	3.8889
4. + The participants accepted the purposes of this workshop.	7	18	1	1	0	4.1481
5. - The objectives of this workshop were not the same as my objectives.	1	4	0	18	4	2.2593
6. - I didn't learn anything new.	0	1	0	5	21	1.2963
7. + The material presented was valuable.	17	9	0	0	1	4.5185
8. - I could have learned as much by reading a book.	0	1	0	13	13	1.5926
9. + Possible solutions to my problems were considered.	3	21	3	0	0	4.0000
10. - The information presented was too elementary.	0	0	0	18	9	1.6667
11. + The speakers really knew their subject.	8	19	0	0	0	4.2963
12. - The discussion leaders were not well prepared.	0	2	0	14	11	1.7407

TABLE 1 (Continued)

STATEMENT	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANT RESPONSES RECEIVED BY EACH ANSWER CATEGORY					
	**5	4	3	2	1	
	SA	A	U	D	SD	MEAN
13. + I was stimulated to think objectively about the topics presented.	7	20	0	0	0	4.2593
14. + New acquaintances were made which will help in my future work.	11	15	1	0	0	4.3704
15. + We worked together as a group.	9	17	1	0	0	4.2963
16. - We did not relate theory to practice.	0	3	2	16	6	2.0741
17. + The sessions followed a logical pattern.	3	21	2	0	0	3.8889
18. - The schedule was too fixed.	0	2	1	17	7	1.9259
19. + The group discussions were excellent.	4	22	1	0	0	4.1111
20. - There was very little time for informal conversation.	0	6	2	14	5	2.3333
21. - I did not have an opportunity to express my ideas.	0	1	0	19	7	1.8148
22. + I really felt a part of this group.	11	14	2	0	0	4.3333
23. + My time was well spent.	11	14	1	1	0	4.2963
24. + The program met my expectations.	12	11	3	1	0	4.2593
25. - I have no guide for future action.	0	0	2	16	9	1.7407
26. - Too much time was devoted to trivial matters.	0	0	2	15	10	1.7037
27. - The information presented was too advanced.	0	1	0	16	10	1.7037

TABLE 1 (Continued)

STATEMENT	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANT RESPONSES RECEIVED BY EACH ANSWER CATEGORY					
	**5 SA	4 A	3 U	2 D	1 SD	MEAN
28. - The content presented was not applicable to occupational programs.	0	0	1	16	10	1.6667
29. + Workshops of this nature should be offered again in future years.	18	8	0	1	0	4.5926
30. - Workshops of this nature will contribute little to my work.	0	0	1	12	14	1.5185
31. + The research findings presented were useful to me in my job.	6	19	1	1	0	4.1111
32. - The references available to participants were not appropriate.	0	2	0	14	11	1.7407

* + statement positive
- statement negative

** 5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = undecided
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

(2) Statements which received a mean score between 3 (undecided) and 4 (agree) were statements:

3 Specific purposes made it easy to work efficiently (+)

17 The sessions followed a logical pattern (+)

(3) Statements which received a mean score between 2 (disagree) and 3 (undecided) were statements:

2 The objectives of this workshop were not realistic (-)

5 The objectives of this workshop were not the same as my objectives (-)

16 We did not relate theory to practice (-)

20 There was very little time for informal conversation (-)

(4) Statements which received a mean score between 1 (strongly disagree) and 2 (disagree) were statements:

6 I didn't learn anything new (-)

8 I could have learned as much by reading a book (-)

10 The information presented was too elementary (-)

12 The discussion leaders were not well prepared (-)

18 The schedule was too fixed (-)

21 I did not have an opportunity to express my ideas (-)

25 I have no guide for future action (-)

26 Too much time was devoted to trivial matters (-)

27 The information presented was too advanced (-)

28 The content presented was not applicable to occupational programs (-)

30 Workshops of this nature will contribute little to my work (-)

32 The references available to participants were not appropriate (-)

b. Analysis of Workshop Evaluation Form Results by Sex, Vocational Area, Number Years Teaching Experience, and Number of Years Participants Have Taught the Handicapped

In general it would appear that a vast majority of the workshop participants appeared quite pleased with the outcomes of the workshop since the positively presented statements received a mean score of 3+ or 4+ and the negatively presented statements received a mean score of 1+ or 2+.

Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5, pages 20, 23, 29, and 33 break down the workshop evaluation analysis further by showing how each statement was rated by specific groups. Table 2 gives a comparison of statement means received by male and female participants, Table 3 gives a comparison of statement means received by particular groups in various areas, Table 4 gives a comparison of statement means received by particular groups with various number of years' teaching experience, and Table 5 gives a comparison of statement means received by particular groups with various number of years teaching the handicapped.

(1) Table 2 (Page 20)

This table gives a comparison of each statement's mean score as derived from the male group and the female group responses.

It can be concluded from this table that the majority of positively presented statements were rated higher by

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF STATEMENTS ASKED

ON EVALUATION FORM ACCORDING TO:

STATEMENT	SEX		DIFFERENCE
	MALE	FEMALE	
	*MEAN SCORE	MEAN SCORE	
1	+ 4.4545	4.3125	.1420
2	- 2.2727	2.1250	.1477
3	+ 4.0909	3.7500	.3409
4	+ 4.3636	4.0000	.3636
5	- 2.2727	2.2500	.0227
6	- 1.3636	1.2500	.1136
7	+ 4.3636	4.6250	.2614
8	- 1.3636	1.7500	.3864
9	+ 4.0000	4.0000	
10	- 1.5454	1.7500	.2046
11	+ 4.0909	4.4375	.3466
12	- 2.0000	1.5625	.4375
13	+ 4.2727	4.2500	.0227
14	+ 4.3636	4.4375	.0739
15	+ 4.3636	4.2500	.1136
16	- 2.0000	2.1250	.1250
17	+ 4.0000	3.8125	.1875
18	- 1.8181	2.1333	.3152
19	+ 4.0909	4.1250	.0341
20	- 2.2727	2.3750	.1023
21	- 1.8181	1.8125	.0056
22	+ 4.6363	4.1250	.5113
23	+ 4.6363	4.0625	.5738
24	+ 4.7272	3.9375	.7897
25	- 1.5454	1.8750	.3296
26	- 1.7272	1.6875	.0397
27	- 1.4545	1.8125	.3580
28	- 1.5454	1.7500	.2046
29	+ 4.4545	4.6875	.2330
30	- 1.4545	1.5625	.1080
31	+ 4.0909	4.1250	.0341
32	- 1.8181	1.6875	.1306

*
5 = strongly agree
4 = agree
3 = undecided
2 = disagree
1 = strongly disagree

the male participants than by the female participants; 60 percent of these statement were rated higher by male participants.

Also, it can be concluded that the majority of negatively presented statements were rated lower by male participants than by female participants; 56 percent of these statements were rated lower by male participants. Therefore, we can finalize that the male participants evaluated the workshop higher than did the female participants.

Those statements with a mean score difference of .4+ are listed below:

Statement 12--The discussion leaders were not well prepared (-)

Female participants disagreed stronger with this statement than the male participants. Concerning this statement there was a mean score difference of .4375.

Statement 22--I really felt a part of this group (+)

Male participants felt more a part of the workshop group than the female participants; the mean score difference was .5113.

Statement 23--My time was well spent (+)

Male participants rated this statement higher than female participants. The mean score difference was .5738.

Statement 24--The program met my expectations (+)

Male participants rated this statement higher than the female participants. The mean score difference is .7897. This was the highest mean difference found when comparing statement means of male and female groups.

(2) Table 3 (Page 23)

This table gives a comparison of mean scores for each statement obtained by participants in the following vocational areas: distributive education, health occupations, home economics, secondary education, and trade and industrial arts.

Participants classified as secondary education participants were persons who served as coordinators of specific types of programs on the secondary level.

Table 3 reveals that 37 percent of the 32 statements had a mean score difference of 1.0+ (at least a one-rate difference) between mean scores obtained by participants in various occupational areas. Sixty-six percent of these statements having a 1.0+ mean score difference were negatively stated. Also, 50 percent of those statements presented negatively were ranked by secondary education participants between agree and undecided while home economics participants scored the lowest mean score on these negative statements 62 percent of the

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF STATEMENTS ASKED

ON EVALUATION FORM ACCORDING TO:

STATEMENT	VOCATIONAL AREA					DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HIGHEST/LOWEST MEAN SCORE
	DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION MEAN SCORE	HEALTH OCCUPATIONS MEAN SCORE	HOME ECONOMICS MEAN SCORE	SECONDARY EDUCATION MEAN SCORE	TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL MEAN SCORE	
1	4.6666	4.0000	4.4285	4.0000	4.2857	.6666
2	2.0000	1.5000	2.0000	3.2500	2.5714	1.2500
3	4.0000	4.0000	3.8571	3.7500	3.8571	.2500
4	4.3333	4.0000	4.1428	3.5000	4.1428	.8333
5	2.0000	2.0000	2.1428	2.5000	2.8571	.8571
6	1.6666	1.0000	1.0000	2.2500	1.1428	1.2500
7	4.6666	4.5000	4.8571	3.7500	4.5714	1.1071
8	1.6666	2.0000	1.4285	2.0000	1.2857	.7143
9	4.0000	4.0000	4.2857	4.0000	3.8571	.4286
10	1.6666	2.0000	1.7142	1.5000	1.7142	.5000
11	4.3333	4.5000	4.2857	4.5000	4.2857	.2143
12	2.0000	1.5000	1.2857	2.2500	2.0000	.9643
13	4.3333	4.0000	4.2857	4.7500	4.1428	.7500
14	4.3333	4.5000	4.5714	4.5000	4.2857	.2857
15	3.6666	4.0000	4.4285	4.2500	4.0000	.7619
16	2.6666	2.0000	2.1428	2.0000	2.2857	.6666
17	3.3333	4.0000	3.7142	4.0000	4.0000	.6667
18	2.6666	3.0000	2.0000	1.5000	1.7142	1.5000
19	3.3333	4.0000	4.1428	3.7500	4.1428	.8095
20	3.3333	3.0000	1.7142	2.7500	1.8571	1.6191
21	2.3333	2.0000	1.4285	2.5000	1.7142	1.0715
22	4.3333	4.0000	4.2857	4.0000	4.4285	.4285
23	4.6666	4.0000	4.2857	4.2500	4.2857	.6666
24	3.6666	3.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.5714	1.5714
25	1.3333	2.0000	1.4285	2.0000	1.8571	.6667
26	2.0000	2.0000	1.5714	1.7500	1.7142	.4286
27	2.0000	2.0000	1.5714	1.2500	2.0000	.7500
28	2.6666	2.0000	1.4285	1.7500	1.5714	1.2381
29	3.6666	4.5000	4.8571	4.0000	4.7142	1.1905
30	2.3333	1.5000	1.2857	1.5000	1.5714	1.0476
31	3.3333	4.5000	4.2857	3.7500	4.1428	1.1667
32	1.3333	1.5000	1.4285	2.5000	1.7142	1.1667

time--representing their disagreement with the negative statements about the workshop.

Concerning the positive statements, 50 percent of these statements were ranked between agree and strongly agree by home economics participants, showing their agreement of the positively presented statements while 50 percent of these statements were ranked low between disagree and strongly disagree by distributive education participants, showing their disagreement with the positive statements about the workshop.

The highest mean score was compared with the lowest mean score and those statements with a difference of 1.0+ between various vocational areas are listed below:

Statement 2--The objectives of this workshop were not realistic (-)

Participants in secondary education (coordinators) received the highest mean score of this statement and were ranked between the ratings of agree (4) and undecided (3). Health occupation participants received the lowest mean score rating of 1.5000 ranking them on the rate scale between strongly disagree and disagree. Therefore, secondary education participants agreed stronger with this statement than did health occupation, distributive education, trade and industrial arts participants.

The high-low mean score was 1.2500.

Statement 6--I didn't learn anything new (-)

Secondary education participants (coordinators) disagreed with this statement with a mean score of 2.2500; health occupation and home economics participants strongly disagreed with this statement with a mean score of 1.000. The high-low mean difference was 1.2500.

Statement 7--The material presented was valuable (+)

Concerning this statement participants in home economics ranked it between agree and strongly agree by obtaining a mean score of 4.8571 while secondary education participants (coordinators) ranked it between undecided and agree by obtaining a mean score of 3.7500. The high-low mean difference was 1.1071.

Statement 18--The schedule was too fixed (-)

Health occupation participants obtained a mean score of 3.0000 which ranked them as undecided on this statement while secondary education participants obtained a mean score of 1.5000 which ranked them between disagree and strongly disagree. The high-low mean score difference was 1.5000.

Statement 20--There was very little time for formal conversation (-)

Distributive education participants ranked between undecided and agree on this statement with a mean score of 3.3333 while home economics participants ranked between strongly disagree and disagree on the

statement with a mean score of 1.7142. The high-low mean difference was 1.6191.

Statement 21--I did not have an opportunity to express my ideas (-)

Secondary education participants were ranked between undecided and agree with this statement with a mean score of 2.5000. Home economics participants received the low mean score of 1.4285 which ranked them between strongly disagree and disagree. The high-low mean difference was 1.0715.

Statement 24--The program met my expectations (+)

Trade and industrial arts participants received the highest mean score of 4.5714 on this statement--ranking them between strongly agree and agree. The lowest mean score was received by health occupation participants who received a 3.000--ranking them as undecided on this statement. The high-low mean difference was 1.5714.

Statement 28--The content presented was not applicable to occupational programs (-)

Distributive education participants received the high mean score of 2.6666 on this statement, ranking them between disagree and undecided. The low mean score was received by home economics participants who received 1.4285 on this statement, ranking them between strongly disagree and disagree. The high-low mean difference is 1.2381.

Statement 29--Workshops of this nature should be offered again in future years (+)

The highest mean score was received by home economic participants; they received a 4.8571 which ranked them between agree and strongly agree. The lowest mean score was received by distributive education participants who received a 3.6666 mean score ranking them between undecided and agree. The high-low mean difference is 1.1905.

Statement 30--Workshops of this nature will contribute little to my work (-)

Distributive education participants received the high mean score of 2.3333 which ranks them between disagree and undecided. The low mean score of 1.2857 was received by home economics participants, ranking them between strongly disagree and disagree. The high-low mean difference is 1.0476.

Statement 31--The research findings presented were useful to me in my job (+)

The high mean score of 4.5000 was received by health occupations participants; ranking them between agree and strongly agree. The low mean score of 3.3333 was received by distributive education participants who ranked between agree and undecided. The high-low mean difference is 1.1667.

Statement 32--The references available to participants were not appropriate (-)

Secondary education participants received the high mean score of 2.5000 which ranked them between disagree and undecided. Distributive education participants received the low mean score of 1.3333 which ranked them between strongly disagree and disagree. The high-low mean difference is 1.1667.

(3) Table 4 (Page 29)

This table gives a comparison of the mean scores for each statement as obtained by participants with various number of years' teaching experience (from 0 years to 8+ years).

Those statements with a mean difference of 1.0+ are discussed below:

Statement 2--The objectives of this workshop were not realistic (-)

The highest mean score for this statement was 3.0000 (undecided) and was received by teachers with three years of teaching experience. The lowest mean score was 1.3333 and was received by teachers with 4-5 years teaching experience. The high-low mean difference was 1.6667.

Statement 3--Specific purposes made it easy to work efficiently (+)

The highest mean score for this statement was 4.4000 (ranked between agree and strongly agree) and

TABLE 4

COMPARISON OF STATEMENTS ASKED

ON EVALUATION FORM ACCORDING TO:

STATEMENT	NUMBER YEARS TEACHING EXPERIENCE						DIFFERENCE BETWEEN H/L SCORE
	0 Yrs. MEAN SCORE	1 Yr. MEAN SCORE	2 Yrs. MEAN SCORE	3 Yrs. MEAN SCORE	4-5 Yrs. MEAN SCORE	8+ Yrs. MEAN SCORE	
1	5.0000	4.1666	4.2857	4.0000	4.3333	4.4000	.8334
2	1.5000	2.3333	2.1428	3.0000	1.3333	2.6000	1.6667
3	4.0000	3.1666	4.0000	4.0000	4.3333	4.4000	1.2334
4	4.5000	3.8333	4.1428	4.0000	4.6666	4.0000	.8333
5	2.0000	2.5000	2.5714	2.0000	1.6666	2.2000	.9048
6	1.5000	1.1666	1.2857	1.5000	1.0000	1.8000	.8000
7	5.0000	4.6666	4.5714	5.0000	4.3333	3.8000	1.2000
8	1.5000	1.8333	1.5714	1.5000	1.6666	1.4000	.4333
9	4.5000	3.8333	3.8570	4.0000	4.0000	4.2000	.6667
10	2.0000	1.8333	1.7142	1.5000	1.3333	1.6000	.6667
11	4.0000	4.3333	4.2857	4.0000	4.0000	4.8000	.8000
12	1.5000	2.0000	1.8571	1.5000	1.6666	1.4000	.6000
13	4.0000	4.3333	4.1428	4.0000	4.0000	4.6000	.6000
14	4.5000	4.5000	4.1428	4.5000	4.0000	4.6000	.4572
15	4.5000	4.0000	4.1428	4.5000	4.6666	4.4000	.6666
16	2.0000	2.8333	2.1428	1.5000	1.6666	1.6000	1.3333
17	4.0000	3.8333	4.1428	4.5000	4.0000	3.4000	1.1000
18	2.0000	1.8333	1.7142	1.5000	2.6666	2.0000	1.1666
19	4.0000	4.0000	4.2857	4.0000	4.3333	4.0000	.3333
20	1.5000	2.1666	2.2857	1.5000	3.3333	2.4000	1.8333
21	1.5000	2.0000	1.8571	1.5000	2.0000	1.8000	.5000
22	4.5000	3.8333	4.5714	4.5000	4.6666	4.2000	.8333
23	4.5000	4.3333	4.0000	4.5000	4.3333	4.4000	.1667
24	4.5000	4.0000	4.2857	4.5000	4.0000	4.4000	.2143
25	1.5000	1.8333	2.0000	1.5000	1.6666	1.6000	.5000
26	1.5000	1.8333	2.0000	1.5000	1.3333	1.2000	.8000
27	2.0000	1.5000	2.1428	1.5000	1.3333	1.4000	.8095
28	1.5000	1.8333	1.7142	1.5000	1.6666	1.4000	.4333
29	5.0000	4.6666	4.7142	3.5000	4.6666	4.6000	1.5000
30	1.5000	1.5000	1.7142	1.5000	1.3333	1.4000	.3809
31	4.0000	4.1666	4.0000	3.5000	4.3333	4.4000	.9000
32	1.5000	1.8333	1.7142	3.0000	1.3333	1.4000	1.6667

was received by teachers with 8 or more years of teaching experience. The lowest mean score was 3.1666 (ranked between undecided and agree) and was received by teachers with 1 year teaching experience. The high-low mean difference was 1.2334.

Statement 7--The material presented was valuable (+)

The highest mean score for this statement was 5.000 (strongly agree) and was received by teachers with no teaching experience and by teachers with 3 years' teaching experience. The lowest mean score was 3.8000 (ranked between undecided and agree) and was received by teachers with 8 or more years' teaching experience. The high-low mean difference is 1.2000.

Statement 16--We did not relate theory to practice (-)

The highest mean score for this statement was 2.8333 (ranked between disagree and undecided) and was received by teachers with 1 year teaching experience. The lowest mean score was 1.5000 (ranked between strongly disagree and disagree) and was received by teachers with 3 years' teaching experience. The high-low mean difference was 1.3333.

Statement 17--The sessions followed a logical pattern (+)

The highest mean score for this statement was 4.5000 (ranked between agree and strongly agree) and was received by teachers with 3 years' teaching

experience; the lowest mean score was 3.4000 (ranked between undecided and agree) and was received by teachers with 8 or more years' teaching experience. The high-low mean difference is 1.1000.

Statement 18--The schedule was too fixed (-)

The highest mean score for this statement was 2.6666 (ranked between disagree and undecided) and was received by teachers with 4-5 years' teaching experience; the lowest mean score was 1.50000 (ranked between disagree and strongly disagree) and was received by teachers with 3 years' teaching experience. The high-low mean difference was 1.1666.

Statement 20--There was very little time for informal conversation (-)

The highest mean score for this statement was 3.3333 (ranked between undecided and agree) and was received by teachers with 4-5 years' teaching experience; the lowest mean score was 1.5000 (ranked between disagree and strongly disagree) and was received by participants with no teaching experience and by participants with 3 years' teaching experience. The high-low mean difference was 1.8333.

Statement 29--Workshops of this nature should be offered again in future years (+)

The highest mean score for this statement was 5.0000 (strongly agree) and was received by teachers

with no teaching experience; the lowest mean score was 3.5000 (ranked between undecided and agree) and was received by participants with 3-4 years' teaching experience. The high-low mean difference was 1.5000.

Statement 32--The references available to participants were not appropriate (-)

The highest mean score for this statement was 3.000 (undecided) and was received by teachers with 3-4 years' teaching experience; the lowest mean score was 1.3333 (ranked between strongly disagree and disagree) and was received by participants with 4-5 years' teaching experience. The high-low mean difference is 1.6667.

(4) Table 5 (Page 33)

This table gives a comparison of the mean scores for each statement as obtained by participants with various number of years teaching the handicapped.

Those statements with a mean difference of 0.7+ are discussed below:

Statement 3--Specific purposes made it easy to work efficiently (+)

The highest mean score for this statement was 4.2000 (ranked between agree and strongly agree) and was received by participants who have taught the handicapped for 2 years; the lowest mean score for

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF STATEMENTS ASKED

ON EVALUATION FORM ACCORDING TO:

STATEMENT	NUMBER YEARS TAUGHT HANDICAPPED			DIFFERENCE BETWEEN HIGHEST/LOWEST MEAN SCORE
	0 Yrs. MEAN SCORE	1 Yr. MEAN SCORE	2 Yrs. MEAN SCORE	
1	4.6363	4.1428	4.2000	.4935
2	1.9090	2.4285	2.4000	.5195
3	3.9090	3.4285	4.2000	.7715
4	4.1818	4.0000	4.2000	.2000
5	1.7272	2.7142	3.0000	1.2728
6	1.1818	1.0000	1.4000	.4000
7	4.6363	4.4285	4.8000	.3715
8	1.7272	1.2857	1.6000	.4415
9	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	--
10	1.5454	1.7142	1.8000	.2546
11	4.1818	4.4285	4.4000	.2467
12	1.6363	1.4285	2.2000	.7715
13	4.2727	4.4285	4.0000	.4285
14	4.3636	4.7142	4.0000	.7142
15	4.3636	4.2857	4.0000	.3636
16	2.0909	2.0000	2.4000	.4000
17	3.8181	4.0000	4.0000	.1819
18	1.8181	2.0000	1.8000	.2000
19	4.0000	4.2857	4.0000	.2857
20	2.5454	2.1428	2.4000	.4026
21	1.8181	1.5714	2.0000	.4286
22	4.3636	4.1428	4.4000	.2572
23	4.4545	4.1428	4.0000	.4545
24	4.4545	3.7142	4.4000	.7403
25	1.6363	1.5714	2.2000	.6286
26	1.6363	1.5714	2.0000	.4286
27	1.6363	1.4285	2.4000	.9715
28	1.7272	1.4285	1.8000	.3715
29	4.6363	4.8571	4.6000	.2571
30	1.6363	1.2857	1.6000	.3506
31	4.0909	4.1428	4.2000	.1091
32	1.9090	1.2857	1.8000	.6233

this statement was 3.4285 (ranked between undecided and agree) and was received by participants who taught the handicapped for 1 year. The high-low mean difference was .7715.

Statement 5--The objectives of this workshop were not the same as my objectives (-)

The highest mean score for this statement was 3.000 (undecided) and was received by participants who have taught the handicapped for 2 years; the lowest mean score was 1.7272 (ranked between disagree and strongly disagree) and was received by participants who have not taught the handicapped. The high-low mean score was 1.2728.

Statement 12--The discussion leaders were not well prepared (-)

The highest mean score of 2.2000 (ranked between disagree and undecided) was received by participants who have taught the handicapped 2 years; the lowest mean score was 1.4285 (ranked between disagree and strongly disagree) and was received by participants who have taught the handicapped 1 year. The high-low mean difference was .7715.

Statement 14--New acquaintances were made which will help in future work (+)

The highest mean score was 4.7142 (ranked between agree and strongly agree) and was received by

participants who have taught the handicapped 1 year; the lowest mean score was 4.000 (agree) and was received by participants who have taught the handicapped 2 years. The high-low mean difference was .7142.

Statement 24--The program met my expectations (+)

The highest mean score was 4.4545 (ranked between agree and strongly agree) and was received by participants who had never taught the handicapped; the lowest mean score was 3.7142 (ranked between undecided and agree) and was received by participants who had taught the handicapped one year. The high-low mean difference was .7403.

Statement 27--The information presented was too advanced (-)

The highest mean score was 2.4000 (ranked between disagree and undecided) and was received by participants who have taught the handicapped for 2 years; the lowest mean score was 1.4285 (ranked between disagree and strongly disagree) and was received by participants who have taught the handicapped for 1 year; the high-low mean difference was .9715.

c. Correlation of workshop evaluation form statements

A correlation matrix of the statements on the workshop evaluation form showed that a high degree of correlation of .70+ existed between these statements:

Statement:	Correlation:	Statement:
7 (The objectives of this workshop were not realistic)	0.70114	10 (The objectives of this workshop were not the same as my objectives)
9 (The participants accepted the purposes of this workshop)	0.73048	20 (We worked together as a group)
13 (I could have learned as much by reading a book)	0.70909	26 (I did not have an opportunity to express my ideas)
13 (I could have learned as much by reading a book)	0.75987	30 (I have no guide for future action)
13 (I could have learned as much by reading a book)	0.83272	33 (The content presented was not applicable to occupational programs
30 (I have no guide for future action)	0.77771	33 (The content presented was not applicable to occupational programs)
34 (Workshops of this nature should be offered again in future years)	0.73986	37 (The references available to participants were not appropriate)

4. Attitudes of Workshop Participants Toward the Mentally Retarded With Special Emphasis on Employability:

Listed below are questions asked to the workshop participants concerning their hiring a mental retardate for a particular job. The questions and percentages of yes and no responses are shown below:

QUESTION: As an employer, would you consider hiring a person with an I.Q. of 72 to be:	RESPONSES	
	YES	NO
a cashier in your business	59%	41%
a janitor during the day? (supervised)	95%	5%
a janitor at night? (unsupervised)	77%	23%
a babysitter for your children?	68%	32%
a clerk in your store?	90%	10%
a dishwasher in your restaurant?	95%	5%
a delivery truck driver?	86%	14%

G. Recommendations

1. Have more field trips, tours, etc., planned along with the regular workshop sessions.
2. Request that consultants bring more "how to do it" kinds of material and information rather than voluminous amounts of theoretical propositions.
3. Instead of there being several consultants, each responsible for a block of time, one or two consultants should be present for the entire workshop. These consultants could conceivably bring in other specialists and coordinate their activities.
4. Put greater emphasis in future workshops of this nature on role playing and social-drama to better dramatize the emotional impact in working with retarded persons. This helps in developing effective expertise.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

MEMO TO: Vocational Teachers of the Handicapped/Disadvantaged

FROM: N. Alan Sheppard
Assistant Professor
Vocational and Technical Education
2125C Derring Hall

DATE: April 18, 1974

RE: EPDA Grant to Support In-Service Education Workshop for Vocational Teachers of the Handicapped

VPI and SU has received an EPDA grant to assist special and regular vocational education teachers to more effectively teach the mentally retarded and multiply handicapped students. This will enable us to provide $60 tuition grants to 32 teachers and $15 per participant for travel to those teachers who wish to enroll in the workshop to supplement their skills in working with handicapped students.

The workshop will be offered as EDVT 498 (Special Study). It will be conducted during the period of June 17-28, 1974, from 1:30-4:30 p.m. (Monday through Friday). The workshop will be available to both undergraduate and graduate students. The course credit allowed is three (3) credit hours.

The workshop will be conducted on the campus of VPI and SU. It will include lecture-discussions, small group work, media presentations, and field trips.

If you would like to take advantage of this opportunity, please complete the enclosed form and promptly return it to me.

There is a restriction on the number of teachers that the EPDA grant can support; thus, we would urge you again to make your intentions known to us as rapidly as possible. After receiving enrollment data from the enclosed form, we will then proceed to select the 32 teachers based on need for the course, critical teaching factors, recommendations by supervisors, and etc.

wls

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Dewey A. Adams
Mr. George Orr

PRELIMINARY ENROLLMENT INFORMATION

If you would like to enroll in the in-service education workshop for teachers of the handicapped, please complete the form and return to:

Dr. N. Alan Sheppard
Assistant Professor
Vocational and Technical Education
Room 2125C Derring Hall
VPI & SU
Blacksburg, VA 24061

I should like to enroll in EDVT 498 (Special Study) - In-Service Education Workshop for Vocational Teachers of the Handicapped.

NAME_____ ADDRESS_____

_____

_____

TELEPHONE_____ _____

Home Business

*REASON(for wanting to enroll in workshop)_____

_____

_____

_____

*Add any additional information on the back of this form that you feel is critical to your situation.

_____

Signed

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL EDUCATION

MEMO TO: All E.P.D.A. Recipients for Summer Workshop

FROM: N. Alan Sheppard,
Project Director

RE: Two-week Summer Workshop for Vocational Teachers of the Handicapped

DATE: June 10, 1974

Congratulations!! A sincere congratulations on being selected as a participant (stipend-supported) in our in-service education workshop on working with the mentally retarded. We are very eager to make the acquaintances of each of you.

Those of you who wish to reside on campus during the two-week period should make plans to arrive at VPI & SU aroung 5:00 p.m., Sunday, June 16, 1974. The housing facility will be Campbell Hall. Those responsible for checking you in will be aware of your arrival. Simply go to Campbell Hall, identify yourself as a participant for the In-Service Education Workshop for Vocational Teachers of the Handicapped, sign the appropriate form, and secure your key. Linen, Towels, and other items for housing will be provided. That is, everything except wash cloths--you will have to bring your own.

Food services will be available in the Dietrick dining facility. On the morning of June 17, please report to the Dietrick cafeteria where your meal tickets will be available in the lower lobby of Dietrick at a table which will be identifiable. Your meal tickets will show meals starting Monday morning (breakfast), June 17, 1974, through Friday afternoon (dinner), June 28, 1974.

Housing and meals for the two-week period will be ninety dollars ($90). This, of course, you will not receive a reimbursement; thus, come prepared to pay for housing and meals. You can pay during our registration period.

Registration and assessment of fees will take place on June 17 at 1:00 p.m. in Conference Room B of the Donaldson Brown Continuing Education Center. To make it as easy as possible on you we have made arrangements with the accounting office to take care of registration and fee assessment. Undergraduate or special undergraduate students registration fee is $54, plus $3.75 for student activity fee. Graduate students will be assessed $60, plus $3.75 for student activity fee.

We anticipate having your $60 checks available at the registration, but in case they are not ready, please come prepared to pay the registration fee. You will be reimbursed.

E.P.D.A. Recipients
Pg. 2
June 10, 1974

In summary, if you're an undergrad or special undergrad, come prepared to pay (if you're participating only in the two-week workshop and will be living on campus):

Housing and meals	=	$90.00
Tuition	=	54.00
Student activity fee	=	3.75
Total		$147.75

Graduate students (participating only in the workshop and living on campus):

Housing and meals	=	$90.00
Tuition	=	60.00
Student activity fee	=	3.75
Total		$153.75

Please remember that you will receive sixty dollars ($60) to defray the tuition costs.

Those of you who are taking more than just the workshop (one or two other courses, the first session or second session) will register in the usual manner. Registration is during the morning of June 17, 1974, thus make every effort to get on campus by 8:00 a.m. so you can get registered. Registration during the morning will be done on the basis of one's surname. See the VPI & SU Summer Time Table.

One final note, PLEASE BRING SAMPLES OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS YOU ARE USING IN TEACHING THE MENTALLY RETARDED OR REGULAR VOCATIONAL STUDENTS IN YOUR CLASSES OR VOCATIONAL LABORATORIES: also, any EDUCATIONAL GAMES, ASSESSMENT DEVICES, ETC. This will be very helpful in the facilitation of some of our sessions, especially the June 27, 1974 session which will focus on modifying instructional materials to more specifically meet the needs of the mentally retarded.

In addition, if you have some good slides, filmstrips, films, etc., of your vocational programs which illustrate how to work with the handicapped, then bring such educational material with you. Share them with your fellow participants.

If you're participating in another workshop during the two-week period, housing and meals can still be facilitated in the same manner as those participating in just one workshop.

If you need to contact me prior to your arrival, please do not hesitate to do so. My telephone number: Home (703) 552-7468; Office (703) 951-5191.

See you on June 17, 1974 at 1:00 p.m. in the CEC, Conference Room B.

Name	Address	Teaching Area
Romono P. Williams	Pembroke, VA	Health Occupations
Carolyn Johnson	2509 Drapers Meadow West Blacksburg, VA 951-1987	Home Economics
Jeanne Griffin	608 Drapers Meadows Blacksburg, VA 951-3506	Home Economics
E. Anne Ayers	2501 Avenel Ave., SW Roanoke, VA 24015 343-2692	Home Economics - Pre-vocational (TMRs)
Margaret J. Bennett	206 Main Campbell 552-9556	Distributive Education Coordinator
Frederick Logan	7500 E. Terrace View Blacksburg, VA 552-3261	Guidance Counselor
Kent D. Sjolander	1402 Giles Road Blacksburg, VA	Pre-Vocational Special Education (Industrial Arts)
Ruth W. Reed	2227 Hunters Road Roanoke, VA 342-5497	Work-Study Coordinator for EMRs
Stanley W. Nesselrodt	305 Campbell Hall	Woodworking Product Assembly for Sheltered Workshop
Peter Van Evera	304 Cambell Hall	Vocational Instructor Program for TRMs (15-20 yrs.)
Cynthia A. Meadows	6300D Terrace View Blacksburg 552-4805	Kindergarten
George W. Beahm, Jr.	303 Campbell Hall	Tool Technology and General Shop
Vicki Fuhrmann	204 Campbell Hall 552-9556	Home Economics (Consumer and Homemaking I)
Ronald C. Myers	508 Riverland Road Roanoke, VA	Maintenance and Repair

APPENDIX-D

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION WORKSHOP FOR
VOCATIONAL TEACHERS OF THE HANDICAPPED

Workshop Directory
(June 17-28, 1974)

Name	Address	Teaching Area
Brenda A. Lee	204 Campbell Hall 552-9556	Vocational Home Economics
Margaret W. Clanton	207 Campbell Hall	Occupational Home Economics
Vicki N. Paris	206 Campbell Hall 552-9556	Distributive Education
Jocelyn Anderson	205 Campbell Hall 552-9556	Student Involvement Co-ordinator
Mary A. Phelps	205 Campbell Hall 552-9556	Home Economics-Occupational Clothing
Roy G. McCarty	1007 Broad Hill Dr. Roanoke, VA 345-1709	Maintenance and Repair
Norborne E. Preas, Jr.	808 Bullitt Ave. Roanoke, VA 344-2392	Building Trades
Alice B. Keen	4741 Showalter Rd., NW Roanoke, VA 366-6023	Commercial Foods
Larry E. Long	303 Campbell Hall 552-9844	Vocational Education Electronics
Rodney F. Wilkins, Jr.	Marriott Blacksburg, VA 552-7001	Assistant Director, Valley Vocational-Technical Ed. Center, Fishersville, VA
C. B. Dix, Jr.	552-4011	Administrative Assistant to Superintendent of Schools, Harrisonburg, VA
Cheryl H. Clark	209 Campbell Hall	Health Assistant I-II
Janie T. Smith	Tech Motel 552-5211	Food Service

APPENDIX-E

WORKSHOP CONSULTANTS

Ms. Susan F. Bourne	Roanoke Occupational School for the Handicapped, Roanoke, Virginia
Dr. Frank Bowles	Special Education Department Radford College Radford, Virginia
Ms. Elizabeth Coates	Roanoke Occupational School for the Handicapped, Roanoke, Virginia
Dr. Ruth Diggs	Norfolk State College Special Education Department Norfolk, Virginia
Ms. Maude Goldston	Virginia State Department of Education Assistant State Supervisor and Coordinator of Special Services Division of Vocational Education Richmond, Virginia
Dr. Cherry Houck	VPI & SU Special Education Department Blacksburg, Virginia
Mr. Wendell R. McCarty	Roanoke Occupational School for the Handicapped, Roanoke, Virginia
Dr. Jay McLoughlin	VPI & SU Special Education Department Blacksburg, Virginia
Ms. Polly Thomas	Roanoke Occupational School for the Handicapped Roanoke, Virginia

EDVT 498 - PRETEST

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION WORKSHOP FOR
VOCATIONAL TEACHERS OF THE HANDICAPPED

Sex: M___ F___

Vocational area: _____

Number of years taught _____

Number of years teaching the handicapped_____

Presently teaching in a program for the handicapped? Yes___No___
If yes, in what vocational area? _____

Teaching Level: Elementary___Junior High___Secondary___Post Secondary___

Place a "+" in the blank to the left of the statement if you feel the statement is true and a "0" in the blank if you believe the statement is false.

_____1. The retarded teenager has the same feelings, attitudes and desires as other children his chronological age.

_____2. The self concept of the retardate is formed according to how the retardate believes others view him.

_____3. There is little relationship, if any, between the degree to which the retarded teenager has experienced success and to how many continual encounters with failure have been a part of his earlier development.

_____4. The range of social disorders among the mentally retarded far exceeds that of the average population.

_____5. To the normal child, the retarded youngster is usually not particularly deserving of reward.

_____6. Mentally retarded students are not particularly eager to engage in school related activities.

_____7. The mentally retarded seem to have a weak repertoire of general information which they can call upon to deal with problems of living.

_____8. The mentally retarded appear quite skillful in generating possible alternative solutions to problems and evaluating the worth of each.

_____9. Specific learning and behavioral problems of the mentally retarded adolescents are those directly resulting from the mental retardation condition.

_____10. There is solid evidence to suggest that mentally retarded adolescents have a higher incidence of sexual perversion than what one could expect to find among other populations in our society.

_____11. Mental retardation means the person's total being is retarded.

_____12. Mentally retarded children are only born to parents whose mental ability ranges from average to less than average.

_____13. The kinds of jobs the mentally retarded can perform are unskilled, service, or short cycle repetitive tasks.

_____14. In occupations ordinarily showing a high degree of turnover, qualified mentally retarded workers tend to excel.

_____15. Mental retardation implies a total absence of skills and aptitudes.

_____16. There is no real dollars-and-cents advantage to hiring the qualified mentally retarded.

_____17. In comparison to non-retarded workers, qualified mentally retarded workers are not good employment risks.

_____18. Studies show that the mentally retarded worker does not take as much pride in his work as compared to the non-mentally retarded worker.

_____19. On certain types of jobs, the qualified mentally retarded worker can excel the non-retarded worker.

_____20. A vital reason for successful placements has been preparation and training, provided by vocational rehabilitation agencies and sheltered workshops which serve mentally retarded adults.

_____21. Most MR pupils cannot expect to become skilled craftsmen.

_____22. Social adjustment on the job is of little concern to the vocational instructor in training MR students.

_____23. Some MR trainees reach a high level of competence in his chosen area of work.

_____24. MRs have no preference in the selection of areas for vocational training.

_____25. Low skill level is the greatest problem faced by the MR trainee on the job.

_____26. The main objective in teaching the MR student is to bring him to a "good helper" status in the vocational skills.

_____27. The MR label makes it extremely difficult to place the trainee on the job in spite of his competency.

_____28. "Hands-on" instruction is the most effective method of teaching skills to the MR pupil.

_____29. Most MRs lose their labeled identity in society once they become regular, successful workers.

_____30. Patience, understanding and genuine concern, are indispensable attributes of the teacher of the MR students.

_____31. Behavior Modification is using common sense t manage people--all people including the mentally retarded.

_____32. We have all used some form of Behavior Modification in our lives and it has been used on us.

_____33. There are two basic aspects of Behavior Modification: (1) Positive reinforcement (Recognition and Reward) and (2) Negative reinforcement (Ignoring, Withholding privileges, and Punishing).

_____34. Behavior Modification Techniques are ineffective with retardates because they are stubborn and ill-natured.

_____35. In considering the use of B. M. Techniques, one must remember that retardates understand language well and are rarely confused or distracted, thus, they follow instructions easily.

_____36 In establishing a B. M. Program to teach retardates one may establish communication more successfully by:

1) Using simple words, phrases or short sentences
2) Using gestures
3) Using physical prompts

_____37. To effectively employ B. M. Techniques one must:

1) Choose a reward the client likes
2) Give the reward only after he does what he was asked to do
3) Give the reward immediately after he does what he was asked to do

____38. When teaching retardates in a vocational area, B. M. is used most effectively if the skills to be taught are broken into small sequential steps.

_____39. Each staff member in a B. M. Program may develop his own technique in giving commands or instructions to a retardate and he may develop his own set of rewards and deprivations.

_____40. Most retardates will respond to a given set of tangible rewards since they do not have as many individual differences as normal clients.

_____41. All teachers are reading teachers.

_____42. It is important to associate subject area vocabulary with tools and equipment to be used.

_____43. Immediate repetition in the story aids retention of vocabulary that has been introduced.

_____44. Reading as a subject is not important for the EMR student since he most likely has met failure in the area and lost interest.

_____45. Practice should be short, spirited, and at frequent intervals.

_____46. When using games or devices to teach reading skills, emphasis must be placed on learning the skills.

_____47. If the remedial reading class is effective, it will not be necessary to teach the reading skills in vocational classes.

_____48. The instructional level must be on the reading level of the student.

_____49. There is no one method of teaching reading because all students do not learn the same way.

_____50. Time should be given by all teachers to teach the developmental skills in the 3 r's and then for functional application of the skill.

_____51. The students with learning and behavior problems are best educated in special classes in public schools.

_____52. The possibility of adapting instructional strategies to the needs of the handicapped learner in a regular classroom setting is good.

_____53. An essential basis upon which to plan the instructional adaptation for a handicapped learner is skills necessary to function in a class.

_____54. Knowledge that a student's IQ range is 55-75 should affect a teacher's expectation to a very low to a high degree.

_____55. A student's ability to perceive, process information, remember, and make relationships dictates instructional adaptations.

SUMMER WORKSHOP FOR

VOCATIONAL TEACHERS OF THE HANDICAPPED

Course Number: EDVT 498 (Special Study)

Project Director: N. Alan Sheppard
Division of Vocational and Technical Education
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
(703) 951-5191

The purpose of this workshop is to assist teachers of both special and regular vocational education programs to acquire the knowledge and competencies necessary to more effectively deal with the handicapped. This purpose will be approached via a series of ten sessions of approximately three hours each Monday-Friday beginning at 1:30 p.m. from June 17 through and including June 28, 1974. Special activities (such as films, field trips, etc.) will be scheduled in addition to the regular afternoon sessions.

The sessions will be conducted by approximately nine individuals with experience in a variety of areas related to the handicapped. The individual sessions will vary in nature; however, a central aim will be to encourage active participation of all involved. "Outside" workshop tasks will be held to a minimum during the actual two-week period, although all participants will be expected to complete specific workshop requirements.

All instructional materials will be furnished free of charge to all participants.

In addition to each participant receiving a stipend to cover the course cost, limited funds will also be provided to assist in defraying travel expenses.

Workshop participants living on campus will be housed in Campbell Hall and meals will be served in the Dietrick dining facility.

Theme: WHAT A MAN CANNOT DO IS NOT AS IMPORTANT AS WHAT HE IS CAPABLE OF DOING

CALENDAR OF ACTIVITIES

Session 1
June 17

REGISTRATION, INTRODUCTIONS AND ORIENTATION TO WORKSHOP

Dr. N. Alan Sheppard
Project Director
College of Education
Division of VTE
VPI & SU

Mr. Larry Lawrence, from the Accounting Office, will register workshop participants and collect fees.

Dr. Sheppard will discuss the rationale, nature, and purposes of the workshop; make introductions; discuss the overall strategy and structure of workshop sessions to follow; and ADMINISTER THE WORKSHOP PRETEST.

A film presentation on the handicapped will also be made during this session.

Tentative Guests:

Dr. Dewey A. Adams, Director
Division of Vocational and Technical Education
VPI & SU

Session 2
June 18

ORIENTATION TO THE HANDICAPPED AND EMPLOYMENT POTENTIAL OF THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Dr. N. Alan Sheppard
Workshop Director

Dr. Sheppard will discuss the meaning of several special education terms related to the handicapped in vocational education; also, he will discuss vocational education's role as well as that of career education in serving the needs of the handicapped. Finally, he will discuss the mentally retarded and their ability to work.

A special slide presentation on working with the handicapped will be given by Peter Van Evera of the Dowell J. Howard Vocational School, Winchester, Virginia.

Session 3
June 19

TEACHING VOCATIONAL SKILLS
TO THE HANDICAPPED

Dr. Frank Bowles
Special Education
Radford College
Radford, Virginia

Dr. Bowles's presentation will cover strategies and techniques in teaching vocational skills to handicapped students; also, he will discuss job placement, referral services, etc., available to the mentally handicapped.

Session 4
June 20

BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION

Ms. Susan E. Bourne and
Ms. Polly Thomas
Roanoke Occupational School for the Handicapped
Roanoke, Virginia

Ms. Bourne and staff will share their experiences in behavior modification of TMRs at the Roanoke County Occupational School, Roanoke, Virginia. Techniques illustrating how to psychologically motivate mentally retarded students to exhibit specific kinds of behavior will be demonstrated.

Session 5
June 21

TEACHING VOCATIONAL SKILLS TO THE
MENTALLY RETARDED

Wendell R. McCarty
Roanoke Occupational School for the Handicapped
Roanoke, Virginia

Mr. McCarty will demonstrate teaching vocational skills under shop and/or laboratory conditions to the mentally retarded. Also, strategies in arranging equipment for the vocational laboratory will be discussed.

Session 6
June 24

ASSESSMENT AND PRESCRIPTIVE TEACHING

Drs. Cherry Houck and Jay McLoughlin
Special Education
VPI & SU

Dr. Houck's and Dr. McLoughlin's session will involve a presentation on assessment considerations, techniques and devices as pertain to the adolescent handicapped and the process through which the teacher develops educational programs based on information obtained as a result of the assessment procedures. They will also conduct a simulation exercise structured both to illustrate the effects of teacher approach on student learning and to foster empathy for the mentally retarded.

Time will be allotted for questions, after which the participants will be involved in small group activities meant to afford them the opportunity of selecting and/or designing assessment devices in line with their area of interests.

Session 7
June 25

STRATEGIES IN TEACHING THE MENTALLY RETARDED READING SKILLS

Elizabeth Coates
Roanoke Occupational School for Handicapped

Mrs. Coates will demonstrate, through the use of instructional films, lecture, simulation, and small group activities, techniques in improving the reading skills of the mentally retarded student.

Session 8
June 26

FIELD TRIP

Roanoke Occupational School for the Handicapped
Roanoke, Virginia
Mr. William Johnson, Principal

Two Sheltered Workshops
1) Goodwill Industries
2) The Roanoke Area Association for Retarded Citizens, Roanoke, Virginia

Session 9
June 27

PROGRAM EVALUATION AND
INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

Dr. Ruth Diggs
Norfolk State College
Special Education Dept.

Dr. Ruth Diggs will give a presentation of the evaluation, modification and construction of materials for use with mentally retarded students. In order to best illustrate the procedures involved, participants will be asked to bring to the workshop samples of the materials which they have been and/or will be working in the classroom, for the purpose of using these materials in the demonstrations.

Dr. Diggs will also discuss some of the efforts being made in the area of program evaluation throughout the country. Specifically, her remarks will focus on evaluation strategies and techniques for assessing the effectiveness of vocational and technical education programs for handicapped students.

Session 10
June 28

OVERVIEW OF SPECIAL VOCATIONAL
EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN VIRGINIA

Ms. Maude Goldston
Assistant State Supervisor and Coordinator
of Special Services
Virginia State Department of Education
Division of Vocational Education

The financial outlook and presentation on existing/proposed special vocational education programs including the legislative aspect of such programs.

EVALUATION AND FINAL REPORTING
Group Reports (Workshop Participants)

Summary of workshop and oral reactions of participants. Overall evaluation of workshop (presentations by consultants, adequacy of workshop facility, etc.)*

ADMINISTRATION OF POSTTEST

Workshop closing thought: "One man's handicap becomes another man's challenge..."

* Please turn in evaluation forms to the designated person or leave them in seat

PARTIAL TASK SHEET

EDVT 498--Special Study

In-Service Education Workshop for Vocational Teachers

The following tasks (Group and Individual) will be evaluated during the Summer of 1974 by the project director.

Group Tasks (only one)

TASK-- Outline a teacher preparation program for vocational teachers of the handicapped only and a program for preparing the regular vocational instructor serving both handicapped and non-handicapped students. Provide the general design of such a program, necessary justifications, unique or novel features, etc.

Individual Tasks

TASK A-- Select one particular skill you normally teach and write up a detailed description of how you would program its instruction in teaching the mentally retarded (EMR or TMR, or both)

TASK B-- Make a list of at least five sources of assistance located within your community for working with the handicapped (mentally, blind, partially blind, neurologically, hard-of-hearing, orthopedically) or disadvantaged. Document the services provided regarding the nature of assistance available from each of the (at least five) agencies/organizations and the mailing address of each.

EDVT 498 - POSTTEST

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION WORKSHOP FOR
VOCATIONAL TEACHERS OF THE HANDICAPPED

Sex: M___F___ Soc. Sec. No._____

Vocational area:_____

Number of years taught:_____

Number of years teaching the handicapped:_____

Presently teaching in a program for the handicapped? Yes___No___
If yes, in what vocational area:_____

Teaching Level: Elementary___Junior High___Secondary___Post Secondary___

Place a "+" in the blank to the left of the statement if you feel the statement is true and a "0" if you believe the statement is false.

_____1. The retarded teenager has the same feelings, attitudes and desires as other children his chronological age.

_____2. The self concept of the retardate is formed according to how the retardate believes others view him.

_____3. There is little relationship, if any, between the degree to which the retarded teenager has experienced success and to how many continual encounters with failure have been a part of his earlier development.

_____4. The range of social disorders among the mentally retarded far exceeds that of the average population.

_____5. To the normal child, the retarded youngster is usually not particularly deserving of reward.

_____6. Mentally retarded students are not particularly eager to engage in school related activities.

_____7. The mentally retarded seem to have a weak repertoire of general information which they can call upon to deal with problems of living.

_____8. The mentally retarded appear quite skillful in generating possible alternative solutions to problems and evaluating the worth of each.

_____9. Specific learning and behavioral problems of the mentally retarded adolescents are those directly resulting from the mental retardation condition.

_____10. There is solid evidence to suggest that mentally retarded adolescents have a higher incidence of sexual perversion than what one could expect to find among other populations in our society.

_____11. Mental retardation means the person's total being is retarded.

_____12. Mentally retarded children are only born to parents whose mental ability range from average to less than average.

_____13. The kinds of jobs the mentally retarded can perform are unskilled, service, or short cycle repetitive tasks.

_____14. In occupations ordinarily showing a high degree of turnover, qualified mentally retarded workers tend to excel.

_____15. Mental retardation implies a total absence of skills and aptitudes.

_____16. There is no real dollars-and-cents advantage to hiring the qualified mentally retarded.

_____17. In comparison to non-retarded workers, qualified mentally retarded workers are not good employment risks.

_____18. Studies show that the mentally retarded worker does not take as much pride in his work as compared to the non-mentally retarded worker.

_____19. On certain types of jobs, the qualified mentally retarded worker can excel the non-retarded worker.

_____20. A vital reason for successful placements has been preparation and training, provided by vocational rehabilitation agencies and sheltered workshops which serve mentally retarded adults.

_____21. Behavior Modification is using common sense to manage people--all people including the mentally retarded.

_____22. We have all used some form of Behavior Modification in our lives and it has been used on us.

_____23. There are two basic aspects of Behavior Modification: (1) Positive reinforcement (Recognition and Reward) and (2) Negative reinforcement (Ignoring, Withholding privileges, and Punishing).

_____24. Behavior Modifications Techniques are ineffective with retardates because they are stubborn and ill-natured.

_____25. In considering the use of B. M. Techniques one must remember that retardates understand language well and are rarely confused or distracted thus they follow instructions easily.

_____26. In establishing a B. M. Program to teach retardates one may establish communication more successfully by:

1) Using simple words, phrases, or short sentences
2) Using gestures
3) Using physical prompts

_____27. To effectively employ B. M. Techniques one must:
1) Choose a reward the client likes
2) Give the reward only after he does what he was asked to do
3) Give the reward immediately after he does what he was asked to do

_____28. When teaching retardates in a vocational area, B. M. is used most effectively if the skills to be taught are broken into small sequential steps.

_____29. Each staff member in a B. M. Program may develop his own technique in giving commands or instructions to a retardate and he may develop his own set of rewards and deprivations.

_____30. Most retardates will respond to a given set of tangible rewards since they do not have as many individual differences as normal clients.

_____31. All teachers are reading teachers.

_____32. It is important to associate subject area vocabulary with tools and equipment to be used.

_____33. Immediate repetition in the story aids retention of vocabulary that has been introduced.

_____34. Reading as a subject is not important for the EMR student since he most likely has met failure in the area and lost interest.

_____35. Practice should be short, spirited and at frequent intervals.

_____36. When using games or devices to teach reading skills emphasis must be placed on learning the skills.

_____37. If the remedial reading class is effective it will not be necessary to teach the reading skills in vocational classes.

_____38. The instructional level must be on the reading level of the student.

_____39. There is no one method of teaching reading because all students do not learn the same way.

_____40. Time should be given by all teachers to teach the developmental skills in the 3 r's and then for functional application of the skill.

Part II

1. Follow-up studies on employed mental retardates indicate that the most important cause for failure on the job is the
   a. lack of essential manual skills
   b. inability to compete with normal workers doing the same job
   c. inability to get along with others
   d. dissatisfaction with the amount of money earned

2. Occupational education for the mentally retarded should begin
   a. as soon as the child enters the MR class
   b. at the junior high school level
   c. when the child enters a vocational high school
   d. when the child is ready to handle tools

3. The sheltered workshop situation is best suited to the
   a. high level educable child
   b. low level trainable child
   c. low level educable
   d. high level trainable

4. Of the following, which statement best illustrates the part that evaluation plays in the program of instruction for mentally retarded children?
   a. Evaluation occurs at regularly planned intervals.
   b. Evaluation is part of the every day program.
   c. Evaluation takes place at the conclusion of a unit.
   d. Evaluation is undertaken just before reports of pupil progress are due.

5. Of the following, in which jobs would the mentally retarded be most likely to succeed?
   a. boxer, baseball player
   b. porter, messenger
   c. cutter, machine operator
   d. body and fender man, gas station attendant

6. The major problem involved in placing a high grade retardate in an industry is
   a. he needs continual close supervision
   b. his fellow employees refuse to accept him
   c. he cannot follow simple directions
   d. his employer expects too much of him

7. Recent surveys indicate that mentally retarded individuals are most apt to find employment through the
   a. Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
   b. State Employment Service
   c. efforts of friends and relatives
   d. Association for the Help of Retarded Children

8. The aim of the program of occupational education for mentally retarded adolescents should be directed chiefly toward development of
   a. vocational goals
   b. training for competitive work on an assembly line
   c. specific job skills
   d. eye-hand coordinator

9. Which of the following approaches will be most appropriate for stimulating the mentally retarded adolescent who has not mastered the beginning reading skills?

   a. textbooks on a primary level
   b. experiential charts prepared by pupil and teacher
   c. commercial materials on health, safety, etc.
   d. comics and other graphic literature

10. One of the goals of occupational education is the adjustment of the mentally retarded child on the job for which he is best fitted. To help him attain this goal, the school must provide a program in which
   a. definite expectancy levels in academic areas are set for the child
   b. training for a specific job is stressed
   c. both manual and non-manual skills are developed
   d. the development of dexterity in the use of common tools is emphasized

11. A sheltered workshop for mental retardates is generally established under the sponsorship of
   a. state departments of special education
   b. training schools for retarded children
   c. parent and/or non-profit organizations
   d. local school boards

12. The major purpose of routinizing such activities as distribution of paper and cleaning up after shop work is to
   a. forestall the rise of poor behavior
   b. direct maximum effort to the learning situation
   c. instill habits of orderliness and neatness
   d. give children an opportunity to work together

13. Which of the following is the major criterion for judging the effectiveness of a program of occupational education?
   a. the retarded individual is able to compete vigorously in the open labor market
   b. the retarded individual is provided with training in a variety of saleable manual skills
   c. the areas of work suitable for mentally retarded individuals are systematically covered in class
   d. the retarded individual is provided with those skills needed for successful adjustment to society

14. In an MR primary class, the occupational education program places greatest emphasis upon
   a. motor control
   b. social living
   c. personal hygiene
   d. development of routines

15. Jose, an eleven-year-old boy, has recently arrived from Puerto Rico. He is unable to read or write, but can speak and understand English. The school psychologist's report indicates the following: MA 7-9, IQ 68 (Stanford-Binet Form L). Jose has been placed in an MR class. The teacher should realize that he
    a. will probably be unable to read
    b. may be of higher intellectual capacity than the test results indicate
    c. is probably at the intellectual level indicated in the psychologist's report
    d. may be of lower intellectual capacity than the test results indicate

EDVT 498 - SPECIAL STUDY

WORKSHOP EVALUATION SCALE

(Place an "x" in the appropriate blank space below.)

Sex: M___ F___

Teaching Level: Elementary___ Secondary___ Post Secondary (Technical school, community colleges, etc.)___

Vocational Area:_____(Please indicate)

Number of Years Taught: _____(Please indicate)

Number of Years Teaching Handicapped Students:_____(Please indicate)

Part I--Directions:

Read each statement carefully and decide how you feel about it. You will agree with some statements and disagree with others. You are offered five possible answers to each statement. The "undecided" answer should be circled only when you have no opinion. Circle one number following each statement. Please answer all statements.

Example:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Vocational teacher education programs need to improve the competency of teachers in working with handicapped students.	5	4	3	2	1

This person feels in no uncertain terms that vocational teacher education programs are inadequate in preparing teachers to function with handicapped students.

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. The purposes of this workshop were clear to me.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The objectives of this workshop were not realistic.	5	4	3	2	1
3. Specific purposes made it easy to work efficiently.	5	4	3	2	1
4. The participants accepted the purposes of this workshop.	5	4	3	2	1

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Un-decided	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
5. The objectives of this workshop were not the same as my objectives.	5	4	3	2	1
6. I didn't learn anything new.	5	4	3	2	1
7. The material presented was valuable to me.	5	4	3	2	1
8. I could have learned as much by reading a book.	5	4	3	2	1
9. Possible solutions to my problems were considered.	5	4	3	2	1
10. The information presented was too elementary.	5	4	3	2	1
11. The speakers really knew their subject.	5	4	3	2	1
12. The discussion leaders were not well prepared.	5	4	3	2	1
13. I was stimulated to think objectively about the topics presented.	5	4	3	2	1
14. New acquaintances were made which will help in my future work.	5	4	3	2	1
15. We worked together as a group.	5	4	3	2	1
16. We did not relate theory to practice.	5	4	3	2	1
17. The sessions followed a logical pattern.	5	4	3	2	1
18. The schedule was too fixed.	5	4	3	2	1
19. The group discussions were excellent.	5	4	3	2	1
20. There was very little time for informal conversation.	5	4	3	2	1

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Un-decided	Dis-agree	Strongly Disagree
21. I did not have an opportunity to express my ideas.	5	4	3	2	1
22. I really felt a part of this group.	5	4	3	2	1
23. My time was well spent.	5	4	3	2	1
24. The program met my expectations.	5	4	3	2	1
25. I have no guide for future action.	5	4	3	2	1
26. Too much time was devoted to trivial matters.	5	4	3	2	1
27. The information presented was too advanced.	5	4	3	2	1
28. The content presented was not applicable to occupational programs.	5	4	3	2	1
29. Workshops of this nature should be offered again in future years.	5	4	3	2	1
30. Workshops such as this will contribute little to my work.	5	4	3	2	1
31. The research findings presented were useful to me in my job.	5	4	3	2	1
32. The references available to participants were not appropriate.	5	4	3	2	1

DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

A general description of the twenty-seven participants who filled out an evaluation sheet on the workshop follows:

SEX

- 16 female participants
- 11 male participants

TEACHING LEVEL

- 25 instructors in secondary education
- 1 instructor in post-secondary education
- 1 instructor in elementary education

VOCATIONAL AREA

- 7 in home economics
- 7 in trade and industrial arts
- 4 in secondary education (coordinators)
- 3 in distributive education (one serving as an administrator)
- 2 in health occupations
- 1 in industrial arts
- 1 in guidance
- 1 in elementary education
- 1 in administration

NUMBER OF YEARS TAUGHT

- 3 had taught 18 or more years
- 1 had taught 12-13 years
- 2 had taught 8-9 years
- 1 had taught 4-5 years
- 4 had taught 3-4 years
- 13 had taught 1-2 years
- 3 were not applicable

NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING HANDICAPPED

- 1 had taught 10 or more years
- 1 had taught 8 years
- 1 had taught 5 years
- 1 had taught 3 years
- 5 had taught 2 years
- 7 had taught 1 year
- 11 had never taught the handicapped